

Pre-Solicitation Conference
June 23, 2016
Draft RFP NNG16547352R
Questions and Answers

Q: Is the current GSFC contract the only contract which is “very highly pertinent”? If not do other large agency level SMA contracts also qualify as “very highly pertinent”?

A: An offeror’s past performance will be evaluated based on FAR Part 15 and the evaluation criteria provided in provision GSFC 52.215-330 Past Performance Evaluation Factor. All past performance references must meet the “recency” and minimum average annual cost/fee expenditures criteria provided in provision GSFC 52.215-330 Past Performance Evaluation Factor for both prime contractor references and significant subcontractor references in order to be evaluated. If a contract is deemed recent and meets the minimum average annual cost/fee expenditures criteria provided in provision GSFC 52.215-330 Past Performance Evaluation Factor, the Government will then determine the degree of relevance –i.e., level of pertinence –of the contract based on size and content. Content is more important than size in the evaluation of relevance.

The SEB will conduct its evaluation and evaluate each Offeror’s past performance in accordance with requirements of the RFP. Is it premature to believe that the current GSFC contract is “very highly pertinent”?

Q: Are you interested in efforts below the size of \$3M per year?

A: As it relates to past performance: For a prime contractor’s contract reference(s) to be considered at least minimally “relevant”, it must meet/exceed an average annual cost/fee incurred established by the RFP.

Q: As it relates to technical approach: are you interested in learning about technical tools available to support SMA processes?

A: We believe that the RFP provides an opportunity for vendors to discuss/proposed technical tools.

Q: What is the extent and nature of Wallops Flight Facility work on SMAS II?

A: At this time, there are no current specific tasks at Wallops; however, center wide functions such as Occupational Safety and Audits and Assessments may require occasional support. Tasks supporting Wallops are not precluded from SMAS II.

Q: Is there an expected timeline for resolution of how the Review Team Office will be structured following the elimination of HQ/IPAQ and how does that impact the SOW for SMAS II?

A: All current plans are for the review office to remain in Code 300. We expect no impact to the SOW.

Q: If an interested party has work with other Government organizations that is relevant will you accept a cross-section of the work directly related to SMAS II plus the contract’s SOW/PWS?

A: As it relates to past performance, the Government will assess the vendor’s past performance that is consistent with the requirements of the RFP.

Q: Will the “Not To Exceed” Labor Rates be used solely to establish task order fee pools and/or budget, or is it also to serve as a bill rate cap?

A: The “not to exceed” labor rates are used to price individual task orders. The Government will pay actual cost that are allowable, allocable and reasonable to the contract.

Q: Past Performance recency requirements in GSFC RFPs has always been 5 years but in this RFP, the recency requirement has been reduced to 3 years. Will the Government consider staying with GSFC’s historical precedent and increase the recency requirement to 5 years?

A: GSFC’s guidelines allows for the recency requirement be within 3 -5 years, increasing the requirement to 5 years will be taken under consideration.

Q: Will the new work coming into Code 300 (i.e. Metrology, Pressure Vessels, etc.) be transformed to the SMAS II contract upon award?

A: SMAS II will be an Indefinite Delivery, Indefinite Quantity contract vehicle, which means that a task order may be issued at any time after award. Currently there is no specific date for the transfer of the work to the SMAS II contract.

Q: Should offerors identify 4 critical risks for each of the 15 SOW sections identified in the RFP? For a total of 60 risks? Or is the intent to identify 4 risks out of the 15 areas?

A: The Final RFP will include revisions to Subfactor A for clarity.

Q: What is the timing of each of the challenges? During what phase of each instrument development do the challenges occur?

A: The challenges presented in section 3.1 and 3.2 occur in the formulation (Pre-Phase A). The Supplier Risk, 3.3, occurs during the implementation (Phase C).

Q: Regarding Scenario Section 3.1: Descope: Will the preliminary mission to the moon only test instruments? Or does instrumentation refer to all 3 instruments?

A: As stated in the scenario, “NASA HQ has decided to reduce the budget and forced the project to eliminate Instruments A and B, leaving the demonstration instrument”.

Q: Having a few years with the new organization, if you had a blank sheet of paper again, what would you change?

A: At this time it is premature since we need to assess how the re-organization is working.

Q: Mission Success was used extensively when describing the Code 300 vision. How does Code 300 measure Mission Success?

A: Mission Success for Code 300 is consistent with the defined success criteria for the missions we support.